		Action Item	9

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION DIRECTIVE

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTER		DATE	April 28, 2021
MOTOR CARRIER MATTER		DOCKET NO.	2021-34-E
UTILITIES MATTER	✓	ORDER NO.	

SUBJECT:

<u>DOCKET NO. 2021-34-E</u> - <u>Dominion Energy South Carolina, Incorporated's Annual Update on Demand Side Management Programs and Petition to Update Rider</u> - Staff Presents for Commission Consideration Dominion Energy South Carolina, Incorporated's Annual Update on Demand Side Management Programs and Petition to Update Rider.

COMMISSION ACTION:

Dominion Energy South Carolina, Inc. has filed its 2021 Annual Update on Demand Side Management Programs and Petition to Update the associated Rate Rider. The Office of Regulatory Staff has reviewed Dominion's petition and has filed a report detailing that review. ORS found Dominion's updated DSM Rate Rider to be developed in accordance with the terms and conditions set forth in Commission Order Nos. 2010-472, 2013-826, and 2019-880. Both Dominion and ORS agree on costs to be recovered in this proceeding, and the total is \$47,948,844. These costs are comprised of \$29,164,781 for Dominion's amortized Program Costs; \$16,950,616 for net lost revenues, and \$1,833,447 as an amortization of the Shared Savings Incentive. These numbers are not contested by the Intervenors in this case.

Accordingly, I move that the Commission approve the following new billing factors for retail electric customers by class for Dominion's DSM Rate Rider:

Residential: \$0.00244

Small General Service: \$0.00500 Medium General Service: \$0.00307 Large General Service: \$0.00131

These rates will be effective for bills rendered on and after the first billing cycle of May 2021. The residential customer using 1,000 kWh per month would have a bill increase of approximately \$0.23 aftereffects of the Tax Rider approved in Commission Order No. 2018-804 are applied.

With regard to DSM Programs, Dominion reported in its filing on significant aspects of program development and its implementation approach for the ten DSM Programs that it was offering at the end of Program Year 10. The Company made six major changes to the program's offerings, many of which aided in the continuation of program participation by customers, even during the COVID-19 pandemic. Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Commission should thank Dominion for its efforts during the COVID-19 pandemic. Although the Company was forced to suspend some of its programs, it was able to modify several of its programs so as to

allow customer participation, even during the pandemic.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to discuss the Intervenor's and ORS's positions. Although Walmart, Inc. had no issues with Dominion's filing, there were issues raised by ORS, the Southern Alliance for Clean Energy, and the South Carolina Coastal Conservation League, ORS had two concerns. First, it found that the Company's actual energy savings have fallen well short of the Company's projections of energy savings for several years. ORS recommends that the Company revisit the methodology used in establishing energy savings projections to ensure better alignment of actual energy savings with projections in the Company's future filings. Second, ORS is also concerned that the Home Energy Check-Up program has failed to be cost effective in Program Years 8 and 9, and is projected to fail the cost effectiveness test in Program Years 10 and 11. Mr. Chairman, although I move that we adopt the ORS recommendations in this case, I would move that the Commission further examine the methodology used in establishing energy savings projections, the cost effectiveness of the Home Energy Check-Up program, and other DSM matters in a future proceeding. The Southern Alliance for Clean Energy and South Carolina Coastal Conservation League (or "the Joint Intervenors") assert that Dominion has acknowledged that 1% savings levels for DSM portfolios are cost effective and achievable in its territory, and that this is a significant change in circumstances from those presented in prior cases. Ultimately, the Joint Petitioners recommend that the Commission order Dominion to file stakeholder informed modifications needed for the portfolio to achieve the 1% or higher savings by its next EE filing.

Dominion responded to the Joint Petitioners by stating that if the Commission approves this proposal, it would be ordering Dominion to be taking action that is already underway, and with ongoing input through a stakeholder process to which the Joint Petitioners are active members. Dominion denies that there has been any "change in circumstances" as described by the Joint Petitioners.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Commission deny the relief sought by the Joint Petitioners in this proceeding. However, I believe that this Commission should continue to monitor that process and review it again in a future proceeding. I would also urge the stakeholder group to further discuss the matters raised by the Joint Petitioners. I believe that more extensive discussion by this group should help clarify the difference in views between the Joint Petitioners and Dominion Energy on the issues presented by the Joint Petitioners.

I so move.

PRESIDING: <u>J. Williams</u>				SESSION: <u>Regular</u> TIME: <u>11</u>			
	MOTION	YES	NO	OTHER			
BELSER		✓			Present in H	earing Room	
CASTON		✓			Present in Hearing Room		
ERVIN		✓			Voting via W	/ebex	
POWERS		✓			Present in H	earing Room	
THOMAS	✓	✓			Voting via W	/ebex	
C. WILLIAMS				<u>Absent</u>	Family Sick	Leave	
J. WILLIAMS		✓			Present in H	earing Room	
						_	

(SEAL) RECORDED BY: J. Schmieding

